

States today. We provide both the medical education, the internship, the residency, the continuing education, that 20 percent of America's doctors take advantage of.

I was surprised to learn that 14 percent of all of Arizona's doctors and 25 percent of Florida doctors were trained in New York. Moreover, the therapies developed and perfected in our academic medical centers offer hope to patients everywhere. Chances are, no matter where you live, you have been touched by the work that has occurred in a New York teaching hospital. We have been instrumental in developing treatments for heart disease, for HIV/AIDS, for developing the therapies on cardiac catheterization, the first to innovate new forms of laser surgery, and the new minimally invasive surgical methods.

Many in this body support NIH funding. We want to double the amount of funding NIH has, but that funding is useless if the research grants cannot go to the top researchers to do the work we hope will come from additional NIH funding.

The U.S. health care system delivers some of the highest quality care to be found anywhere. The reason that happens is because we have a partnership. We have our local community hospitals in small towns and rural areas. We have our larger hospitals in bigger cities in every State in the country. Then we have the so-called teaching hospitals that provide what is called tertiary care. When you are really sick, when you need extra special help, that is when everybody at home has said: There is nothing more we can do for you, go to Sloan-Kettering, go to New York Presbyterian, go to Mount Sinai. There is someone there who can give you the help you need. We are very proud to provide that service to our country.

I hope we will be successful in the legislation we plan to introduce today to protect our academic medical centers. I am calling on our colleagues in both Houses to ensure the provision to eliminate these IME cuts in any Medicare package we enact this year. I hope what seems like an arcane, somewhat abstract issue, is understood as being the extremely important, critical concern that it is.

If one looks at the number of physicians trained, the cures and therapies that have been invented, the last resort care that saves lives that others had given up on, there is no doubt that our teaching hospitals are absolutely essential to the quality of health care in America. We need to do everything we can to make sure they stay healthy and provide the kind of care we have come to take for granted.

Mrs. CLINTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CLINTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, this has been cleared with the Republican leader. I ask unanimous consent morning business be extended until the hour of 1 o'clock today with Senators permitted to speak therein for a period not to exceed 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 30 minutes in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FAST-TRACK

Mr. FEINGOLD. Madam President, I rise to offer some comments on the proposed trade legislation before us, and in particular on the so-called Trade Promotion Authority provisions in that package, also known as fast-track.

As a number of my colleagues have noted, the issue of whether or not to enact fast-track procedures is not a question of whether one favors or opposes free or fair trade, but rather what role Congress plays in trade agreements.

The fast-track proposal we are considering, and its predecessors, are quite recent inventions.

Prior to the Tokyo round of the GATT, there was no fast-track mechanism.

In fact, of the hundreds and hundreds of trade agreements our Nation has negotiated and entered into, only five have used the fast-track procedures.

This by itself should dispose of the argument that fast-track is necessary for us to negotiate trade agreements at all.

Really, what we are saying here is that fast-track has been the exception, not the rule, with regard to trade negotiations.

The previous Administration negotiated and implemented over 200 trade agreements without fast-track.

What were some of those agreements?

Madam President, I don't think I really need to tell you, but they included:

The Market Access Agreement with Argentina for Textiles and Clothing, the Market Access Agreement with Australia for Textiles and Clothing, the Agreement on Bilateral Trade Relations with Belarus, the Market Access Agreement with Brazil for Textiles and Clothing, an Agreement concerning Intellectual Property Rights with Bulgaria, an Agreement Between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Cambodia on Trade Relations and Intellectual Property Rights Protection, the Agreement on Salmon and Herring with Canada, the Agreement on Ultra-high Temperature Milk with Canada, the Agreement on Trade in Softwood Lumber with Canada, the Agreement on Intellectual Property Rights Protection with Ecuador, a Memorandum of Understanding on Trade in Bananas with Costa Rica, several agreements with the European Union, an Agreement on Intellectual Property Rights Protection with India, several dozen agreements with Japan, several dozen agreements with Korea, and many, many more agreements with dozens of other countries.

Just last year, this body passed legislation implementing the U.S.—Jordan Free Trade Agreement, also negotiated and implemented without fast-track procedures.

We passed not only bilateral agreements, but multilateral agreements such as:

the Information Technology Agreement, which involved over 40 countries, the Financial Services Agreement, and, the Basic Telecommunications Agreement.

President Clinton did not need fast track to negotiate those agreements, and President Bush does not need it to negotiate additional agreements.

While the ability to negotiate and enter into international agreements are inherently part of the President's constitutional powers, the Constitution grants exclusive authority to Congress "to regulate Commerce with foreign nations."

Congress has sole constitutional authority over setting tariff levels and making or changing Federal law.

Those who support fast-track constantly make the argument that if you want free trade, you have to enact fast-track.

They equate fast-track with free trade. The reason is obvious. The arguments for free trade are powerful. Indeed, I agree with those arguments.

We as a nation are better off in a world with freer trade than we are without it.

But the underlying premise, that we need fast-track to achieve free and fair trade, is absolutely false.

I have referred to the hundreds of trade agreements negotiated without fast-track procedures.

That is evidence enough.

But let me also argue that not only is fast-track not necessary for free trade, it may actually undermine it.

One of the greatest defects of the NAFTA and GATT agreements was the